THEOLOGY

VOL. LV MARCH, 1952 No. 381

Editorial

IT will be news to most English readers that there is now (in the U.S.A.) another series of "Bampton Lectures" beside the series that has played such a famous part in our own divinity. The third course in this new series was delivered at Columbia University in 1950 by Dr C. H. Dodd, and has now been published in England—*Gospel and Law: The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity*.[1]

Anglo-Saxon Christianity is incurably moralistic. The man in the pew and the man in the street, however hazy and uncertain they may be about the articles of belief, do nevertheless believe this—that Christianity has got to do with being good. Whatever else it is meant to bear on, it is meant to bear on conduct. The popular idea of a clergyman is of a man who goes about exhorting people to be good—or at least reproaching people for being bad; and contemporary preachers, even if they handle other themes, commonly are most convincing—because most convinced—when they are urging ethical or religious duties upon their hearers. However little of the New Testament the English still know or care about, they still have the notion that "the Sermon on the Mount" is a sublime ideal and that somehow or other Christianity ought to be like that.

The up-to-date theologian is so infuriated by the obtuseness of this notion that he is inclined to have no patience with it, and simply to cry it down. But that is a mistake. Of course, people who suppose that Christianity is principally an ethical code or the enunciation of a moral ideal have not yet seen its point. All the same, their preoccupation with ethics is wholesome, much more wholesome than a preoccupation with ritual or mysticism would be, and the witness of the Church in England is most fruitful when it takes hold of the native concern with conduct and shows how much more is involved in it than is commonly imagined. It may indeed be well to administer a preliminary shock by roundly asserting that what St Paul says about the impossibility of being justified by the works of the Law applies not only to Jewish legalism but also to English moralism. But the ordinary Englishman will rightly be suspicious of any teaching which treats the relation between the Law and the Gospel as one of pure antithesis (though he will not put it like that). Yet it is not easy either for him or indeed for anyone to be clear in his mind about what the precise relation between the Law and the Gospel is according to the New Testament.

[1] Cambridge University Press, 9s. The titles of the separate lectures are: (i) Preaching and Teaching in the Early Church, (ii) Principles and Motives of Christian Ethics in the New Testament, (iii) The Ethical Teaching of the Gospels, and (iv) The Law of Christ.

It is here that Dr Dodd's lectures come to our aid. He observes that the ethical teaching (*didache*) of the New Testament Epistles bore a close resemblance to the teaching of the moral guides of the Graeco-Roman world, and was in harmony with the standard of conduct that was commended by Stoicism as well as by Hellenistic Judaism. There is reason to suppose that apostolic teachers, so far from imparting instruction that was patently novel, sometimes drew upon an already familiar formulation of ethical precepts. What was new in the Christian ethic was not so much its content as its direction and quality and the perspective in which it set the moral life. "For Christianity, ethics are not self-contained or self-justifying; they arise out of a response to the Gospel" (p. 10).

Dr Dodd proceeds to show that the direct dependence of the Christian ethic on the Gospel appears in four ways. First, the eschatological perspective sets even conventional standards of conduct in a new light and gives them a new sanction. "The Kingdom of God had been inaugurated on earth in an act which was both God's judgment on the iniquities of men and the supreme opportunity afforded by his mercy for forgiveness and a fresh start" (p. 27). The sense of impending catastrophe and of living at a critical moment provided a final motive for moral earnestness and a sober sense of responsibility; it cleared the air and made plain what the things are that in the last resort are worth caring about. But also the arrival of the last things laid bare the heights and depths of the moral possibilities of human nature. "Within the workaday precepts which the church put forth, there lay the potentiality of immensely more exigent moral demands and more efficacious moral resources than men had thought of before" (p. 32). Secondly, the conception of "the Body of Christ" transformed men's understanding of their social relations; they belonged not only to a social organism (that was not a new idea) but to a community of which Christ was the Head. Its claim upon them was his claim, and its demands were always subject to his demands. Thirdly, the idea of "the imitation of Christ" cleansed the idea of imitating God (which again was not new) of its dangers. It can no longer lead to self-deification or "behaving like a little god", for what above all is to be imitated in Christ is his emptying himself of his glory. Fourthly, the foundation of all ethical conduct is now love (*agape*), which "is not a virtue among other virtues to which men can aspire. It is that total attitude which is brought about by exposure to the love of God as it is expressed in Christ's self-sacrifice" (p. 44).

Turning to the ethical teaching of the Gospels, Dr Dodd notes its difference in tone from that of the Epistles. Here we meet not straightforward maxims that can be directly transferred to the field of conduct; nor do we find the enunciation of abstract ideals or principles. The Lord's parables and his sayings with their vivid, picturesque and dramatic quality speak to the imagination. They bring home the fact that a "zero hour" has arrived which has put the relations between God and man on a new footing. The final moral issues can no longer be shirked; limitless possibilities have been

opened up. "To repent and believe the Gospel" means to accept the truth of this situation with the judgment that it brings upon us and the offer of movement in a new direction.

This new direction can be described as "the Law of Christ", which is none other than the aboriginal law of man's creation, and it has therefore to be proclaimed to all men and not only to members of the Church. Dr Dodd takes those theologians[1] to task who regard the view of Christianity as "the New Law" (a view which is already present in the New Testament, especially in St Matthew's Gospel) as "a descent of the Church into a new legalism" (p. 66). Certainly the Law of Christ is to be contrasted with "the law of commandments contained in ordinances"; it is the law of the new covenant, a law "written on the heart". Christ's "precepts stir the imagination, arouse the conscience, challenge thought, and give an impetus to the will, issuing in action. . . . The precepts cannot be directly transferred from the written page to action. They must become, through reflection and through effort, increasingly a part of our total outlook upon life, of the total bias of our minds. Then they will find expression in action appropriate to the changing situations in which we find ourselves" (p. 77).

This is a book that will be worth reading more than once during Lent. It may be added that, if Dr Dodd's rendering into English here of passages from the New Testament is a foretaste of what the new translation of the Bible will be like, then the doubts that some of us have entertained about whether the time of so many Biblical scholars ought to be employed in that laborious enterprise can be set at rest.

The Historic Episcopate

THIS article is not intended to propose a new interpretation of the historic episcopate, but to suggest certain limits within which an interpretation might be found that would be more widely acceptable than the particular theory of Apostolic succession, which has been held by an increasing number of Anglicans since the end of the seventeenth century, and lately defended by the Bishop of Oxford and his collaborators in *The Apostolic Ministry*. This theory seems to me open to three objections. First of all it offends the formed convictions of non-episcopal churches by seeming to deny them a real ministry and sacramental means of grace. This would still be a serious objection even if no idea of reunion between the Anglican communion and the English Free Churches, and other Protestant communions in the mission field and in America, was in any way in the wind. But it might not be so grave if it were not reinforced by

[1] It is not clear that Dr Dodd does justice to the position which he criticizes, since he pays no attention to the traditional distinction between the three uses of the Law. What in effect he appears to be saying is that not nearly enough emphasis has been laid on the third or "didactic" use of the Law.

a second objection, that apologists for the theory, who have commonly been men of great learning and controversial skill, have failed to provide evidence to convince historians that the distinction between bishops and presbyters, as we find it securely established at the end of the second and in the third century, is a direct development from the distinction between the Apostles and the local ministry in the New Testament. Many who firmly believe that Christ founded a Church, that the Apostles were the beginning of the ministry, and that the ministry of the Catholic Church is in the true succession of the Apostles, are not convinced by conjectural restorations, however plausible, of the way in which the monarchical episcopate emerged or developed out of the Apostolate and the local presbyterate.

A third objection is heard less often, but it is not without its own importance. Consecration and ordination have been limited to bishops in the Catholic Church, and in nearly all the older heretical churches, at least since the third or the fourth century. But there is no uniformity in the theory whereby this practice has been defended. St Jerome, who in this matter was a principal authority for medieval interpreters of the tradition of the Fathers to the Western church, definitely thought that the episcopal monopoly of ordination was of ecclesiastical and not of apostolic institution,[1] and his opinion is reflected in the medieval and modern Roman Catholic view that bishops and priest-presbyters are one order. We may think that St Jerome, writing in the fourth century, knew less about the second than we do ourselves. We may consider that Eutychius of Alexandria, who agreed with him, had no sufficient authority for his statement that the Patriarchs of Alexandria were for some time consecrated, not by bishops, but by twelve presbyters of the local church.[2] It still seems to me difficult to maintain, on the authority of Catholic tradition, against the uncertainties of historical scholarship, a view that was doubtfully regarded throughout the medieval period. That only a bishop could consecrate was undoubtedly church law at the time of the Reformation, but it was not so certain that it was Apostolic tradition. This knowledge must affect our judgment on the actions of those who appealed from current church law to primitive practice.

Whatever view we take of its earliest origins, the rise of the monarchical episcopate is an historical fact, and it seems to me that any balanced view of its theological significance might well begin by rejecting the theory that represents it as a symptom of the decay of the Church into semi-paganism, either in the old Puritan form that found classical expression in the Elizabethan *Admonitions to the Parliament*, or in the Liberal Protestant form in Harnack's *History of Dogma*. This is not to deny the evidence set forth for instance by

[1] Epistle 146 in *Pat. Lat.* 22, c. 1194. See St Thomas Aquinas in *S.T.*, pt III, Q. 40, art. 5, Council of Trent, Sessio xxiii, canon 2.

[2] Eutychius (Said Ibn Batriq), Patriarch of Alexandria from 933 to 941, wrote an Arabic world history translated into Latin by Edward Pococke, Oxford, 1656, and incorporated in this translation by Migne in the Greek *Patrologia* III. It seems to me that the relation of his sources to the lost *Chronographies* of Julius Africanus would repay investigation. See the article on Egypt by H. Hyvernat in *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. V.

Dr T. F. Torrance in his able book on *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*, that the Fathers of the second century were men of their own time, living in a Hellenistic, not in a Jewish, environment, with a limited understanding of the Hebrew elements in the Old and New Testaments, and, in particular, with a very limited understanding of St Paul. We need to be reminded that the Church in every age speaks from within its own historical situation, and is always tempted to distort the gospel by presuppositions of whose origin and nature Christian thinkers are imperfectly aware. But this element of refraction of the gospel by reference to a situation, and by the control of current modes of thinking, has been present in the Church from the beginning, and will be present until the end. It is not absent from the New Testament writings themselves. It is certainly present in our own reading of the New Testament, despite some new and valuable correctives discovered in the laboratory of modern criticism. No clear line can be drawn between the purity of the primitive Church and the wretchedness and greatness of the Church throughout the ages.

If we accept the historic episcopate as a gift of God, a means of grace for the preservation of the unity of the Body of Christ through centuries of history, and not as a mere device of men, I do not think that in so doing we need condemn those who in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and again in the crisis which divided the Evangelical movement in the eighteenth, classed it among human inventions. Furthermore we can acknowledge it as a means of grace, necessary to its own proper end, without claiming that it is the essential and exclusive means for the transmission of all sacramental grace.

Such an acceptance of the institution of episcopacy as God's gift to the Church does, however, imply that Presbyterians and Independents were both wrong when they claimed, in the debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to possess alternative original patterns of Scriptural church polity from which the Catholic churches had fallen away. It also implies that Anglicans, and a good many others, who said that forms of church order were "things indifferent", spoke rashly and too soon. In the light of our experience in the last four hundred years since the Reformation it would be difficult for anyone who cares for the unity of the Church to say that differences of order are "things indifferent" in the sense that they make no difference to the unity of the Body of Christ.

I have no doubt that those who made affirmations of this kind were principally swayed by the conviction that while Scripture shows us a ministry of the Church, no constitution for that ministry, no rules or degrees of subordination, are revealed in the New Testament. All the churches of the Reformation were agreed in holding, in the words of the Anglican article VI, that

> Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite and necessary to salvation.

The Anglican divines were quick to see, in the course of controversy with their Puritan adversaries, that Scripture was not a textbook of church order, but for the first hundred and fifty years after the Reformation they generally drew the inference that matters of order were not of fundamental importance. The evidence for this has lately been set forth with great clarity and candour by Professor Norman Sykes.[1] The facts are by no means new to students of the period, and I do not see how his general picture can be seriously disputed. I should nevertheless hold that in face of schisms in this country which were primarily about matters of order, rather than about matters of theology, the development of a more rigid view in the Church of England was inevitable and natural. Hooker and the Caroline divines taught the Anglican church to find authority for her episcopal order in the continuous development of the Church in history, rather than in the text of Scripture. Their successors were compelled to defend that order with increasing emphasis, and naturally came to stress the part played by the Church in the formation and acceptance of the New Testament canon. A natural line of development seems to me to link Hooker's criticisms of the Puritan insistence on the letter of Scripture as a necessary warrant for every detail of church order with modern Anglo-Catholic emphasis on the priority of the sacraments and institutions of the Church to the New Testament writings, which rather presuppose than explain their significance.

Every stage of this development has brought some fresh aspect of the truth into focus, and into some danger of being exaggerated. Our problem to-day is to combine the wise caution of the Caroline divines in refusing to pronounce judgment upon defects of order in non-episcopal churches with the concern of later Anglican theologians with the unification of the ministry on an episcopal basis, not just as a practical convenience, but as a means of grace for the preservation and restoration of the unity of Christendom.

Criticism of the doctrine of the Apostolic succession as a "pipe-line" theory seems to be directed at a somewhat superficial presentation of the idea that was common in the second half of the nineteenth century when water and gas were constantly being laid on in towns and villages served by church elementary schools. A more accurate metaphor is that of an inheritance transmitted by known rules, and registered in the court of probate. But adoption provides a better analogy to consecration and ordination than hereditary succession. Adoption can take place in informal as well as in formal ways, and with degrees of formality. In certain cases it may be well both for the parties concerned and for society at large that an adoption which has long been an established fact should be registered and regularized. In such cases the act, though formal, is still rich with spiritual meaning. This is the kind of image that might well be before our minds when we consider the episcopal ordination of ministers in Presbyterian or Congregational orders in a church that has decided to adopt the historic episcopate as the basis for the unification of the

[1] *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, Theology Occasional Papers, new series, No. 11, 1948.

ministry. The ordinations of the Free Churches, in the words of a distinguished Free Church theologian,[1]

> are not authorizations for ministry only in a particular community, but for service to the whole Church of Christ. It may be doubted if they would fail to recognize that further authorization is needed, if there is to be a closer drawing together and a healing of the sundered parts of the Body of Christ; nor is it clear that they would refuse a form of episcopal ordination, as representing the whole Church, provided it were mediated by bishops *and presbyters* acting in consort.

This certainly implies that the act of episcopal ordination is not in itself the stumbling-block, but I think it has been a mistake to suppose that obstacles would therefore be removed by episcopal ordination or reordination without any interpretation of its significance. To many such silence must seem to imply at least a tacit acceptance of the most widespread and the most earnestly asserted traditional doctrine of the episcopate. Dr Taylor's words imply another doctrine which would not necessarily exclude this one, but could be stated with sufficient fullness and clarity to avoid leaving the meaning of episcopacy an open question.

Perhaps the most important reason underlying the reluctance of Anglo-Catholics to explore possible alternatives to their own interpretation of the Apostolic succession lies in the mistaken belief that every step towards closer union between the Church of England and the Protestant churches associated with her in the Ecumenical movement is a step away from the Orthodox and the Church of Rome. This impression seems to me to be based on a misunderstanding of the perspective of Roman Catholic Ecumenism. Roman Catholics who are seriously engaged with the problem of reunion are primarily concerned with the gulf that grew up in the sixteenth century between Rome and the churches of the Protestant Reformation. Looking for ways across that gulf, they have always taken a sympathetic interest in the Church of England, but their main concern is with the Ecumenical movement as a whole. Everything that strengthens links between the churches with Catholic traditions and the more traditional Protestant communions must help their primary task. Any withdrawal or slackening of Anglican interest in the Ecumenical movement would be a blow to them, and to all Ecumenists.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

Great Preachers—XIII. John Henry Newman

NEWMAN'S fame as a preacher rests primarily on the Sunday evening sermons which he delivered as vicar of St Mary's Oxford, i.e. *Plain and Parochial Sermons*, and they alone will be taken into consideration in this article. They were at first intended not for members of the university but for his parishioners—shopkeepers, college and domestic servants, and the like. Very soon, however, they began to draw undergraduates from Oriel, and then from the other colleges,

[1] Dr Vincent Taylor in *The Expository Times* for June 1951.

and senior members of the university too. But Newman was careful always to keep his preaching simple enough to meet the needs of his parishioners, although eventually they formed only a small section of the congregation.

No one ever attempted to be or ever was less of an orator in the French sense of the word. He made use of hardly any gestures; his voice was naturally melodious and clear, but he spoke without inflexion. His sermons lasted only about a quarter of an hour.

At the times when the Tractarian controversy was raging particularly fiercely, the curious flocked to St Mary's to hear what Newman would say. They were disappointed to find that the preacher ignored altogether the conflicts that were going on. In the pulpit he was not concerned to defend opinions or a party. He simply preached the Gospel, but the inspired way in which he did so did more to win adherents to the movement than any discussions or polemics.

These sermons show better than anything else what was the aim of the Tractarians: it was not to form a school, but to reanimate a religion. All who came to hear Newman, whether they were sympathetic or hostile, went away saying to themselves that what really mattered to the preacher was not to impose a new fashion on people but to help them to see the will of God and to follow it. Nowhere does Newman's religion and indeed his sanctity reveal itself so completely as in these sermons.

In *The Grammar of Assent* he was to develop at length a distinction, which he held to be of capital importance, between notional and real assent. Notional assent is what one gives to a truth simply in consequence of abstract reasoning. Real assent, on the other hand, supposes what the scholastics would call a profound connaturality between subject and object, the outcome of an experience of appropriation. One could say of these sermons that they had no other purpose than to make their hearers pass, with regard to the Christian truths, from notional to real assent.

The whole of Christian dogma is here and the whole ethic of the Gospel, but in a form which demands a Yes or No not only from the intelligence, but from the conscience. Whence did these sermons derive this power?

In the first place, Christian dogma was alive in Newman's words because what he said was always drawn directly from the Word of God. His knowledge of the Bible was extraordinary. His dependence on it went far beyond fidelity to the letter of Scripture. His sermons were much more than strings of Biblical texts; it is their fidelity to the Word, one might also say their continuity with it, which strikes one. Such fidelity is quite different from a dead literalism. It supposes, and in fact it is, a discovery of the great themes, the permanent ways, the currents of life, which traverse the whole Bible and make its unity at once so living, so flexible, and so firm.

Christian truth had taken hold of Newman—and here he owed much to his reading of the Fathers—like the living truth of a story, of a cosmic drama into which God has entered, which he has stage by stage directed from within, of which he has become in Jesus Christ

the principal actor. But this divine story of the people of God in the Bible is also our own story. It is the story of God, but it is the story of man too. For it is the story of God's coming to man to enlighten him about his status and to bring him the succour without which he cannot be himself, what God made him to be.

Thus it is not surprising that Newman's knowledge of the Bible is equalled only by his knowledge of the human heart. Any number of witnesses could be cited who went more or less casually to St Mary's, and who were astounded to find that the frail figure in the half light, who spoke so calmly, was speaking to *them*, was speaking to them about *themselves*, and saying what they had thought they alone knew. Newman pierced the heart of every man. Masks fell off; disguises were stripped away. Consciences that had been dulled and deaf came to life and were irretrievably disturbed. We touch, in this almost magical power of communication, the deepest meaning of the motto Newman chose when he was made a cardinal and which is perhaps the final secret of these sermons: *Cor ad cor loquitur!*

This power of Newman's was no doubt enforced by one of his natural gifts which Bremond described as "poetic". Newman had a kind of visionary faculty which enabled him to see invisible realities, the most transcendent as well as the most immanent in the human heart. This gave him a mysterious and prodigious capacity for communion, for human sympathy. He seems to know us and our experiences better than we do ourselves.

But he kept this faculty under strict control, so that it was always subordinated to the message which he had to deliver. Sermons like those on "The Invisible World" or on "The Individuality of the Soul" bring before our eyes a new universe, only to leave us in the immediate presence of him who alone fills it. Newman constantly opens our eyes to visions of the transfiguration. But he constantly forbids us to rest there. He uncovers them only to draw us to the Cross which they foreshadow and to which his whole design is to lead us.

The inexorable note of demand which sounds through this preaching is the supreme mark of its greatness. Not for a moment do Newman's sermons, although they are among the most perfect literary compositions to which the Christian pulpit has given birth, admit of being relished as mere works of art. An unbeliever can read Bossuet's *Oraison funèbre du grand Condé* and enjoy it without any misgivings. It is impossible simply to enjoy any sermon of Newman's. Everyone who listens to them is absolutely prohibited from adopting the attitude of a spectator. Whether you like it or not, you must hear them as a word *ad hominem*.

It was said that one could not leave St Mary's church without realizing the obligation to give something up, to renounce oneself, to escape from the grip of habits. The spoken word compelled one to a decision, to a costly decision. The gospel that Newman proclaimed began not by consoling but by disturbing his hearers. "To be at ease", he said, "is to be unsafe." Man is a sinner, which means that it is a terrible thing for him to fall into the hands of the living God.

To conceal this from him would have only the result of making the revelation sooner or later more terrible still. And the change from sin to holiness is not, as enthusiasts imagine, easy and instantaneous. It is the most laborious of tasks, which, once it has been seriously undertaken, is always issuing in new and more exacting demands.

Into the self-complacency of nineteenth-century England these sermons break, forbidding men to be satisfied or to settle down at any point on the way. They are a relentless appeal for detachment again and again renewed, for efforts more and more costly, for self-sacrifice which must at last be complete. The call of Abraham: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house . . ."; the invitation of Jesus to the rich young man: "Go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor: and come, follow me"; this is Newman's last word to the flower of the English aristocracy, to the finest products of Oxford humanism.

Another aspect of these sermons should be noted, for it casts a particularly vivid light on what was most profound in the Oxford movement: an aspect which I shall boldly describe as "apocalyptic". All the men of the movement, and Newman more than any of them, sensed that they were living at a decisive epoch in history. The conflict in which they had engaged seemed to them from the outset to go beyond the questions immediately at issue. It is not enough to say that behind the affair of the suppressed Irish bishoprics they perceived the much graver problem of the nature of the Church, and the rights and duties of its members and ministers. Their epoch seemed to them the hour when the powers of evil were awaking, as was explicitly foretold in Holy Scripture. In the bourgeois Liberalism, to which they were opposed, they discerned, and Newman to his dying day did not cease to denounce, a supreme effort of the powers of evil to eject from the world the saving energies of the Cross.

Though they did not absolutely condemn the established authorities, or reject without qualification the achievements of modern man, they were convinced that these authorities were willy-nilly playing Satan's game, and that these achievements were a snare by means of which the spirit of pride was capturing men whose faith was enfeebled. They were penetrated by the idea that this world is awaiting its dissolution which may come suddenly, and that the Christ may come at any moment to visit us, to judge us, and to condemn us. Every human enterprise thus seemed to them futile, unless it involved compromising oneself for the sake of Christ against the world.

That the Oxford sermons express such a view of the matter is saying too little. It is the framework in which everything is set. For Newman, this revelation of the powers of antichrist that had already begun would lead to a new and strange revelation of the Kingdom of Christ. This was not for him one notion among others; it was his basic conviction.

He was aware that he had derived this apocalyptic framework from his Evangelical teachers. But though he abandoned later some of its sectarian corollaries, such as the identification of the Pope with anti-

christ, it is remarkable that he continued to regard this sharply distinguished conception of human history as Christian and Catholic, more particularly the pessimistic interpretation of contemporary history with its eschatological expectation of an impending crisis. However critical he became of the detailed interpretations of the apocalyptic expositors of Scripture whom he had frequented in his youth, he always maintained that their main principle was basic for every genuinely Christian understanding of the history of the world.

And indeed this distinction needs always to be drawn. In every age the saints have lived in expectation of the imminent manifestation of the divine Kingdom beyond the reign of evil and its apparent conquests. And in every age there has equally been the temptation to buttress the assurances of faith with too definite and secure predictions. But never ought this error of the imagination, which is so natural to the makers of apocalypses, to be taken to justify any relaxation of the eschatological consciousness. A Christianity installed in this world, which has made its peace with this world, and which is as little concerned to go beyond it as to be embarrassed by it, has never been anything but a decadent Christianity.

L. Bouyer.

Philosophy and the Bible in Karl Jaspers

The Western tradition of philosophy has always been heavily indebted to the Bible, but always chary of acknowledging that debt. Hence, on the one hand, the preoccupation of some of its greatest minds with the problem of God's existence; hence, on the other, the effort to establish this by purely rational procedures. As against the total thinking, at once religious and philosophical, that was characteristic of Augustine and Bonaventure, Aquinas asserted the distinction between natural theology and revealed truth, with the Bible to be drawn upon only for the exposition of the latter. Kant marked a fresh beginning with his introduction of faith into philosophy, though this was a postulate of the moral consciousness and not the faith in the living God which made the Bible. Kierkegaard enriched philosophy with insights derived from the Bible, it is true, but his conclusions, especially his revival of the *credo quia absurdum*, were not such as to commend him in academic circles other than theological. Now, however, in Karl Jaspers we have a philosophy that claims to be rooted in faith, in the venture of the whole person on what transcends the world and the self. What is the relation of this to the Bible?

The content of philosophical faith, as Jaspers defines it in *Der Philosophische Glaube* (translated under the rather misleading title *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy*), can be put in three sentences. The first is that *God is*. By this much more is meant than an abstract assertion of God's existence. A God who could be demonstrated would be no God. What is meant is that the world is not self-sufficient, it depends on a Power beyond it; that human life

contains its meaning, not in itself, but in a Truth we are here to seek. The second is that *there is an absolute imperative.* The distinction between good and evil is not of our own making, it is no mere product of social evolution and the experience of the centuries; in conscience we encounter that which has an absolute claim upon us, that which we were born to serve. The third is that *the world is the sign-language of the Godhead, to be read by the self in its ultimate venture.* Nothing here below is to be identified with God, but from nothing is he absent. In the order and beauty of nature, in life and death, solitude and society, he is to be met with in openness to truth, responsibility, and fellowship with other selves.

Here, then, we have the latest form of natural theology. But Jaspers does not pretend that he has reached these results by any process of unaided reasoning. He frankly admits that he belongs, as we all do, in a civilization permeated by influences deriving from the Bible. No doubt other factors have been at work, noticeably classical antiquity—but that was mediated to us by the Chuch—and modern science, but in his *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte* he agrees with A. N. Whitehead that medieval theology and the Biblical doctrine of creation provided the intellectual climate in which modern science could flourish. Great as are the spiritual treasures of the East, they are not ours as the Bible is: we may learn from them, but it has made us. In *Europa der Gegenwart* he declares that our civilization will perish if it loses contact with the Bible and its message of the living God. Seldom has a philosopher, even among those who call themselves Christians, used such language of the Bible. Behind it lies a personal experience. For, when he was dismissed from his chair at Heidelberg by the Nazis, he devoted his enforced retirement in large measure to the study of the Bible, and was particularly fascinated by the figure of Jeremiah.

Jaspers sometimes uses the word "revelation" for the Bible, but sometimes refuses to do so. For him it is a product of men's spiritual experience, of the encounter with God at the crises of life, pain, guilt, and death. Contrary to the judgment prevalent among theologians, he finds the value of the Bible as much in its diversity as in its unity. The very fact that it is at all points historically conditioned and reflects so many types of spiritual experience makes it impossible to regard it as an external authority and enables us to find in it a hearth at which to kindle our own torches of faith and hope. But, of the various forms of religion contained in the Bible, there are three he would have us explicitly reject. We must break, for example, with the alliance between religion and nationalism in the O.T., an alliance that Protestant, especially Calvinist, circles have sometimes attempted to renew, always with unfortunate results. Nor can we accept the religion of law and priest, of authoritative command and sacerdotal hierarchy, whether Jewish or Christian. Finally, the Christian claim of deity for Christ and atoning efficacy for his death must be rejected. No man nor event in this world can be identified with God: that would be idolatry.

But the most serious objection to Biblical religion has still to

come. The Bible has produced three great religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and each in its way makes the claim to exclusive revelation. Each looks upon itself as the one true religion destined to supersede all others. Religion in the West has therefore been intolerant in spirit and remains so to this day. Indeed, many Christians and Moslems would claim that this exclusiveness is the glory of their faith. But towards such intolerance a neutral attitude is impossible; it is the duty of every lover of freedom and truth to oppose it. Its results in the past have been disastrous, as witness the furies of religious war and persecution, and the division of Christianity into so many jealous sects that the secularization of the State and social life became necessary to peace within the community. In our own day, Jaspers deplores the spirit he finds among theologians in his conversations with them, self-assurance, an unwillingness to discuss since one is already in possession of absolute truth, and indifference towards the inquirer.

Perhaps, however, it is possible to separate the Biblical message from the exclusive claim that has been made for it. Jaspers thinks that it is possible. Did not Amos declare that Israel was not the only chosen people, that the hand of God was in the making of Syria and Philistia also? Did not Malachi call for the Temple to be closed, while everywhere among the nations, by whatever name men addressed their gods, the one true God accepted all pure worship as offered to himself? And did not Jesus refuse the title "good" as due only to God, and therefore not to himself? At this point, however, he pauses. So honest is he that he reflects that the standpoint from which he approaches his subject is that of philosophy and not of religion, so that what religion is as seen from within he cannot know, and therefore may be misjudging it. Perhaps what seems arrogance to him is not so for the genuinely religious spirit, just as what the theologian brands as self-will in the philosopher is really, for the latter, the humble acceptance of responsibility for the truth that has been vouchsafed to him.

Any attempt here to criticize Jaspers' position must therefore reckon at the outset with the fact that it is made from the Christian standpoint and may therefore do less than justice to the philosopher. Nevertheless, it is central to the thought of Jaspers that truth lies in communication between selves, the open, honest, and unreserved meeting of those who differ. There are three points at which this communication may be attempted.

(1) I doubt whether the conception of God with which this philosophy works does justice to its own deepest insights. For it, God communicates with men by his reticence rather than by his revelation. Precisely because he cares so much for men, he abstains from any degree of interference with their freedom. He works always by placing responsibility upon them; he keeps himself in the background so that they may discover truth by their own effort; he allows them to be exposed to hazard and tried almost to the limit of endurance, lest he should stunt their manhood in its growth by coming to their assistance too soon. He is the *Deus absconditus* for our sake.

Yet this same philosophy, as has already been said, lays great stress on communication between persons and on love as the sharing of life to the uttermost with another. One of its master-words is "commitment"; we find ourselves only as we bind ourselves to others and to concrete tasks in daily life. The individual must enter into the situation of his fellow and give himself to him in it; we are made as we give ourselves away so. Why should all this be denied to God? Should we not rather think of God as one who is continually involved in the world, in the human happinesses and tragedies with which it is fraught, as one who is for ever giving himself? Does God simply wait for us in the limit-situations of death, pain, guilt, conflict, and so on, withholding himself till we have met their challenge? Does he not actually enter into those situations and meet us in them? If so, there is no reason why the *Deus absconditus* should exclude the *Deus revelatus*. God reserves himself sometimes as a prize for which we are to struggle, but he also offers himself as a gift to be received. The idea of grace is not unknown to Jaspers; life itself is gift and grace, he would say. Why not then allow that God may act on our behalf, that there may be a real entry into history on his part?

(2) If so, this makes it possible to see that the sharp antithesis Jaspers draws between philosophical and religious faith is not valid. For him, religion is a matter of authority. It exists in the form of a church as the recipient of a supernatural revelation. This revelation in turn is expressed in symbols, whether ritual or dogmatic, and is committed to the charge of a class of men whose duty is to teach others. The believer enters into this system of life, doctrine, and worship, as one who takes over a vast spiritual heritage. For example, he does not need to wrestle personally with the problem of death; he has the assurance that the soul is immortal or that Christ has been raised from the dead. He is thus supplied with ready-made solutions, whereas the philosopher has to live all the time at his own charges. The philosopher has no right to condemn religion, for he knows that much of his own thinking is dependent upon it, that it can create fellowship and renew the life of whole peoples as no argument of his can ever do. He wishes it well, he recognizes it as a valid form of spiritual life, but for himself he must reject it and live by faith.

But this is surely to misunderstand faith as it is seen from within, though it must be admitted that much of the faith which actually obtains in our churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, is mere acceptance on authority. But the preacher's appeal to his congregation is to pass beyond this passive acceptance to appropriation of an inward and spiritual quality. We may illustrate this from the example of Christ's resurrection, an illustration which, incidentally, is not taken from Jaspers himself. Is it not an essential part of the Easter message that Christ is to be met with here and now by us as individuals? How many times have the words of Paul, "last of all, he appeared to me also", been used to emphasize this? For the New Testament, the resurrection of Christ as an event in the past has no saving efficacy except as it is repeated in our own hearts. We must die with Christ and rise again. So

The cross on Golgotha
Can never save thy soul.
The cross in thine own heart
Alone can make thee whole.

Faith is the moment in which the objective becomes subjective; what is true without me becomes true for me.

(3) We can now go on to consider the crucial question of the claim made by, or for, Biblical religion. Here Jaspers draws a distinction, which we may accept, between the absolute and the universally valid. The former is that which grips my whole being, so that I yield it unreserved allegiance. But this will always be historically conditioned, since it will be my truth, appropriate to my particular situation. Paradoxically, it will be absolute by being perfectly relative, or, if you prefer, perfectly adequate. The universally valid, on the other hand, is that which is true for all men in all situations. As such, it will be abstract and impersonal, like the laws of logic or the established conclusions of science. It will be relative also, though in a different way, since it can be apprehended only when one takes up a special standpoint, when one assumes the role of a spectator instead of an actor. In neither case, therefore, have we a truth on which an exclusive claim can be based. There is my neighbour's truth beside my own, as there are standpoints other than that of the scientific consciousness.

Now it is quite true that the absolute of religious conviction is a subjective absolute. In less technical language, it is personal and implicates the whole self in a manner that admits of no reserve. What I apprehend at such a moment fills my whole horizon, it enters me and remakes me, so that I am only in virtue of it; for the delivering instant my faith and my being coincide. The truth that saves me is the truth that speaks to *me*, to an Englishman of a certain age, social position, education, temperament, and life-history. But if it is to *save* me it must pierce through all this to what I am before God; it must deal with the universal human situation implicit in my particular historical situation. That is to say, it is true for me only as it is at the same time true for all men. It is universally valid, if you care to use that expression, but not, like a scientific proposition, because it is detached from all personal considerations. It is universally valid because it is so utterly personal, something for the soul in its need, yearning, and self-abandonment upon God.

Now, the object of devotion is in the nature of the case incomparable—that is, it is in a class by itself and does not admit of being compared with others. He who contemplates a change in his religion may compare, say, Christ and Buddha. But as long as he merely grades these as superior and inferior, he is neither a Christian nor a Buddhist: he only becomes such when he decides to admit one of them to the throne of his soul and thereby to exclude the other from it. The moment we undertake a comparison between our own religion and another, we have changed what we are dealing with; for our religion is only ours as it holds us, it undergoes a change into something different when we hold it, as it were, at arm's length to be

examined dispassionately. Or rather, we can compare our religion with another because our religion is not the absolute conviction which mastered us, it is the particular and historically conditioned form under which we apprehend this, and therefore is relative, one instance out of a class.

We have therefore to distinguish between two planes, the plane of devotion, on which a single allegiance shuts all else out for the time being, and the plane of comparison, on which two or more institutions, doctrines, or forms of worship, are placed side by side. On this second plane there are several possible judgments, but only two need be considered here. The first is that one's own religion is exclusive, has a monopoly of truth, the second that it is one truth among several available truths. Each of these judgments is at once true and false. The first is true in so far as it gives expression to the absolute conviction that is faith, false inasmuch as it removes this conviction from the plane to which it belongs and projects it on to the other, where it becomes perverted. The second judgment is true in so far as it expresses the recognition that my truth is always mine and therefore human and imperfect, never to be identified with God's truth, always to be checked and supplemented by such aspects of that truth as others have seen while I missed them. It is false because it fails to recognize the absolute commitment without which there would not have been such a thing as my truth.

It is not only the philosopher who makes the mistake of confusing what is exclusive for devotion with what claims illegitimately to be exclusive for comparison; the theologian is often equally guilty. The solution of the problem lies in the recognition that my truth is never God's truth as such, but at the best my apprehension of God's truth, and, alas! may even be my misapprehension of it. In so far as it is of God, it is for all men, and I am under an obligation to share it with them. In so far as it is of myself, I am under an obligation to place it alongside of what others have seen of him and to correct my insight by what I can learn from them. Truth, as Jaspers insists, is no man's private possession, it lies in communication. It is by openness to one another that we learn, yet how can we learn save as we give frank expression to our deepest convictions? Finally, the Christian does not claim that Christ has a monopoly of truth, but that all truth is seen most adequately in his light. That is not some extra claim he makes for Christ; it is why he is a Christian.

NOTE

Since the completion of this article, twelve broadcast talks over the Basel radio have shown that Jaspers is still concerned with the problems raised for philosophy by Biblical religion. Published in 1949 under the title *Einführung in die Philosophie*, they are now available in an English translation by Ralph Manheim as *Way to Wisdom* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.). Appendices to the lectures give helpful guidance to the reader who proposes to undertake the study of philosophy, and in the English edition they include an essay on Philo-

sophy and Science. This is in fact the inaugural lecture delivered by Jaspers at Basel.

The book is probably the most readable of all that have yet appeared from him and is invaluable as a guide to his thought, not only on religious problems, but also on philosophy and its mission in the modern world. Throughout Jaspers is concerned with God as the foundation of life in the individual and society. He is to be found by faith rather than by knowledge, and man achieves his destiny in freedom only as he depends humbly upon him. One chapter gives in brief compass the survey of history in *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*. The message of the whole book is contained in one of its sentences: "Unlimited devotion to God is the authentic mode of existence." It offers a natural theology based not on nature but on conscience. It calls philosophy back to the age-old effort to find a truth by which the soul may live. Even if the theologian is tempted to dismiss much of it as already familiar, he may learn from the virile faith, at once humble and courageous, self-critical and confident in God, by which the book is inspired throughout.

E. L. Allen.

Are Angels Superfluous?

My encounters lead me to suppose that the educated Christian's belief in angels rarely exceeds his belief in centaurs and unicorns. Of course, it is true that his Old and New Testaments and Prayer Book and Hymnary have many clear and striking passages about the host of heaven, true also that he repeats these without much conscious insincerity. But his angels are dead. It is not that he has anything against them—indeed, he finds them charming, especially in carols and stained-glass windows—but rather that there is something quite fatal to them in our modern air.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that our inability to take angels seriously comes from either superior knowledge or profounder thinking. Indeed, I am sure the matter is the other way round, and that our disbelief is due much more to poverty of imagination than wealth of reason, to human parochialism than universal enlightenment. In what follows I shall try to set down a few of my reasons for holding this opinion.

What, in fact, has happened to our angels? To answer this question we need to see them in their setting: we need to ask what has happened to our universe—to the cosmos in which they used to play so vital a part, and in which they are now superfluous.

Perhaps it is impossible for us to imagine what it was really like to live in the sort of universe which confronted men at the beginning of the Christian era. It was altogether too alive; the spheres above a man's head were over-populous, haunted, crowded with a vitality at once magnificent and terrible, full of threat and of promise. The later Jewish literature described a great company of angels who were God's courtiers and ambassadors and the administrators of nature,

and other angels who were the heavenly bodies themselves, the watchers, living stars. The whole Hellenistic world was fascinated by the divine sun and planets and stars: sublunary beings were not more but less animate and intelligent than the rest of the universe, and a man had only to lift his eyes to look into heaven, into a country whose splendour and divinity increased with its distance from himself. He knew his place. He lived below-stairs, under the very eyes of his betters.

This cosmos became part of the Christian inheritance. Clement of Alexandria taught that the heavenly bodies are all living creatures, and Origen described them as rational and moral beings capable of sin: the sun, though desiring to be freed from the body, is content to pursue his path in the spirit of service. Two centuries later St Augustine did not definitely rule out the possibility that the sun and stars are angels, and as late as the thirteenth century St Thomas Aquinas himself conceded that to believe celestial bodies have souls is no heresy. In general, however, the medieval universe was populous not with living bodies but with spirits—finite incorporeal substances without sensitive or nutritive faculties, but capable of temporary association or even union with material bodies—a great hierarchy of supernatural intelligences directing the great hierarchy of natural processes and steering the stars in their courses. The universe was still alive, but its mind and body had parted company.

Medieval man robs the angels of their bodies; renaissance man robs them of their functions; modern man robs them of their existence—he adds the finishing touch. Every advance in science has thrown an angel out of work, or else compelled him to dress up as Tendency which bodies observe, or a Law of Nature which they obey, or a Force to which they submit. And now these last angelic disguises have worn thin and been seen through: compulsive laws and forces are reckoned almost as mythical as their winged originals.

Nor are we left with so much as a dead universe. For one by one its sensible qualities have been gathered in from the object over there to its perceiver here. The sun's warmth and brightness and colour, his beauty, and even his motion, are no longer his but ours: they belong to the beholder's eye and not to heaven's. And finally the sun's bare matter or physical substratum has been reduced almost to nothing but a set of mathematical formulas. Apart from us our cosmos is not even an engine or a firework display: all that it seems to be we read into it. It is our projection. Our sun is first a god, then a corpse impelled by a wraith, then a mere corpse adrift in the blue sky, then a few fast-decaying remains, and in the end something less than thin air. And the fate of our sun is the fate of all the stars. We have changed places with the universe: we who used to be its desert are now the oasis.

It has taken us a millennium thus to disprove our angels, and we have done so with immense thoroughness. All that was above our heads is now drawn into them—divine order and intellect, the science of sidereal navigation, the entire furniture of that high and beautiful country. As the body of our expanding universe is centri-

fugal, so its mind is centripetal. What once we attributed to the principalities and powers in the heavens we now claim as men on earth. The truth is not that we have grown out of our angels, but that they have grown into us. They have come down and converged upon us and possessed us, though it is plain that in the course of their descent they have greatly changed for the worse.

Indeed, our refutation of angels has been altogether too thorough: it has become something like their demonstration. For if this is a disproof of the life above us, then eating is the disproof of food and learning the disproof of books. The only way that we who are terrestrial and solar and galactic can begin to show that our earth and our sun (our developed star, the solar system) and our galaxy are dead is by committing suicide at once: for so long as we (who are our own samples of them) are alive to their lifelessness they live in us, and so long as we are conscious of their unconsciousness they are conscious in us. They have passed from transcendence to immanence, not passed away. They have migrated, not absconded—how can their visit here, to this corner of the universe, be their exit from it? If they have been reduced to an absurdity, then we are that absurdity. We are always forgetting that man is not only man, and that in him every hierarchical level from the lowest to the highest is at least potentially present. It is our vice to try to isolate ourselves (as if we could!) from all our life-sources—not only from our Source, but from every stream that flows down to us from It. No wonder our planet and star and nebula are dead, when directly they put forth a limb (and we are their limbs) we amputate it, and directly they show any intelligence, any science, any love, any goodness, any wickedness (and of these we all have first-hand knowledge) we call them accidents and anomalies and intrusions in a world that is prejudged to be incapable of anything of the sort. We suffer from the insane delusion that we have been parachuted into the universe from outside, and are therefore clues only to what the universe is *not* like. We leaves are sure our Yggdrasil Tree is dead—because it is so obviously not a leaf.

Such an outlook is in the long run disastrous as well as silly, for the centripetal mind that possesses us, the angel who in us has come to deny the transcendent world and all other angels and every trace of divinity but its own, is well on the way to becoming a devil. We are inspired with a knowledge and purpose that are hellish rather than heavenly, because they lack nearly all objective reference and natural piety, all wonder and awe and humility, all reverence for what lies beyond ourselves.

Yet there are signs of our conversion. Little by little we are being rid of our superstition that all which is not human is infra-human. We have begun to suspect that other species are not necessarily sunk in primitive stupor—witness the recent discovery of the bees' language; that other planets—Mars in particular—may be far ahead of us; that other stars and galaxies may well have a life compared with which our life is merely vegetative. This is a great awakening at once for us and for our night-world. But it is no more than a first opening of the eyes at early dawn. We have still to join the mind we have

found to its body, and to see the life in the stars as the life of the stars instead of something parasitical. We have still to awake to the fact that heavenly bodies are not cosmic cannon balls infested with men, any more than human bodies are skeletons infested with cells.

The signs are that at last, after so many centuries of contraction, a huge expansion is about to begin: we are ready for the tremendous vision of a hierarchy of mind and meaning that lies altogether outside ourselves. Our angels are already trying their wings for that long outward flight which will make them angelic again, and I think that before very long we shall once more look up into a visible heaven that is in every sense above us. Then it will come as a revelation and a revolution that we have never ceased to look right into the realm of the bright angels, and that we really are in heaven all the while.

And after all even common sense is on the side of the angels without knowing it. Is it likely that the structure of the universe is so ill-balanced that all is orderly and filled and complete up to our human storey, and that thereafter there is just emptiness till we get to the roof? Between ourselves and the physical substratum—a packed hierarchy of particles and atoms and molecules and cells; between ourselves and the Apex of the hierarchy—nothing. It is incredible. Incredible also that we should fail to see in our obsession with the infra-human and denial of the supra-human a defect of imagination, or an obstructed view due to our half-way position in the hierarchy. Doubtless my particles and cells never suspect the existence of any levels above their own—and still less are aware of how their present acts issue in the writing of this sentence about them—but that is no reason why my lower levels should infect the higher with their blindness.

For the Christian this question of hierarchy is crucial. Plainly the medieval universe was top-heavy, just as ours is bottom-heavy, and plainly hierarchical symmetry is what we need. But this means that our angels must come to life again. Without them, as Richard of St Victor says, our universe is acephalous, *quod est inconveniens*. And ungodly also. For disbelief in angels is near atheism. Machinery that makes and runs itself has no need either of managerial staff or of inventor, and certainly our levelled-down and proletarian cosmos has no need of a king. If his angels are superfluous, he also can be spared. But a hierarchy, a full and symmetrical hierarchy of heaven and earth, implies a Head. In truth our self-glorifying war against the Court of Heaven has been aimed at its Sovereign, and our resubmission to it is a part of our resubmission to him.

D. E. Harding.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Bro. George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

Père Bouyer is a member of the French Oratory, and the author of

Le Mystère Pascal which is shortly to appear in an English translation.

Dr Allen is a Lecturer in Theology at King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Mr Harding has divided his adult life almost equally between England and India, and between theological and philosophical studies on the one hand and architecture on the other. He has been a W.E.A. lecturer in these subjects, and is a practising architect. His forthcoming book, *The Hierarchy of Heaven and Earth*, is the background of his article in this issue.

CORRESPONDENCE

"DOWN PEACOCK'S FEATHERS"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

On reading your note on "Down Peacock's Feathers" in the January issue of THEOLOGY, I looked up my copy of the Homilies (Clarendon Press, 1832) and found that the "Misery of Mankind" was without the words in the text, but had a note as follows: "The following is added in AB: 'Let us look down upon our feet, and then down peacock's feathers, down proud heart, down vile clay, frail and brittle vessels.' "

In the advertisement to the edition of 1822 printed at the beginning of the volume (which is the fifth edition from the Clarendon Press since 1800), A is explained as the first edition of the first book, July 31, 1547; B as the earliest edition in which the Homilies of the first book being twelve are divided into thirty-two parts. This book is dated August 1549. A and B as used in the 1822 edition are "preserved in Corpus Christi College in this University" (presumably Oxford).

Sincerely yours,
JOHN ARMAGH.

THE PALACE,
ARMAGH.
7 *January* 1952.

[Other correspondents have written to the same effect.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

RIGORISTS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Since the Rev. B. C. Pawley has singled me out, in his article "Concerning 'Rigorists' " (THEOLOGY, January 1952), as an example of those whose anti-rigorist views are so disastrous to the cause of true religion, I should be grateful for an opportunity of making some comment upon the argument which he advances. I should have expected that one who lays so high an emphasis upon loyalty to Christ as the governing factor in the Church's ministry would also have had

the charity and good sense not to make imputations which are unsupported by the text to which he refers. It is as improper for Mr Pawley to say that I assume that "Christ's will . . . can be done only by giving to the people what will flatter and please them, and that no good can ever be done by resisting their will or antagonizing them", as it would be for me to assert that his paper bears every sign of being the outcome of the frustrated pride of a parochial pope. I prefer to believe that both he and I share a passion and determination to declare God's word and will to those among whom we are set down to minister. Where we differ is in our estimation of some of the ways in which this can best be done.

Mr Pawley is at pains to make clear what is the meaning which he attaches to this word "rigorist". But he is deluding himself if he thinks that the Roman Church in Britain is rigorist in the lofty sense in which he uses the word. It is "highly successful" in maintaining an impressive façade of rigidity and unanimity and high-mindedness —but there is little integrity behind it all. Has he never wrestled with cases of "mixed marriages"? It would have been even more helpful if he had also made clear in what sense he uses the word "Church". I hope he will not think me lacking in courtesy if I suggest that he appears to be writing from the standpoint of a member of a religious cult, rather than as a member of the Body of Christ. For Christ our Lord did not save only those who approve of him, but all mankind. The humanity which suffered upon the Cross for our redemption was not that of a particular person, but all humanity. For our Lord is not a man, but representative Man—as well as God. So that now the Risen, Ascended, and Glorified Christ, in whom the Church consists, is the King and Head of our race (as F. D. Maurice teaches us) and not just the director of those who attend upon the public worship of the Church on earth. What we have to grasp is that the redemption of man and the whole order of creation has been achieved by Christ. It is none of our business to try to undo the work of Christ by placing outside the range and scope of divine grace those whom Christ has himself redeemed. Rather must we gladly face the ridicule of which Mr Pawley speaks with so much distaste, and must run the risk of a cheapening of the human valuation placed upon our ministrations, in order that all may have an opportunity of claiming the inheritance which Christ has provided for them. We may have every reason to suppose that the heirs are unworthy of the kingdom which they receive; but we are not given the right or the power to disinherit those who are included within the saving work of Christ. None of this should be taken as in any way approving of the lack of faith of many of those who make use of our ministrations. Nor should we connive at the gross exploitation of holy things for ignoble motives. But what we may not do is to contract out of a situation which is partly of our own making. Plainly, God allows us to be in the place and the situation where we are; and the weight of the frustrations and griefs and angers and failures, which is the lot of every parson, is also part of what God allows. In short, the tensions which bear so heavily upon all who take their pastoral work seriously

are not to be resolved by action which has the effect of disinheriting those who have been made heirs of Christ.

Yours faithfully,
ERIC WILD.

ST GEORGE'S VICARAGE,
6, WRIGHTINGTON STREET,
WIGAN.
8 *January* 1952.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

If Mr Pawley's apologia is any criterion of the outlook of a movement which is dividing the Church to-day, then it is clear that the protagonists of this view have not begun to grapple with the real problem in England, which is something almost unique in Church history. It is easy to over-simplify the matter by appealing back to the New Testament, but here is in truth no parallel at all. The Apostolic Church existed and expanded in a context of naked idolatry, where distinctions were clear and unblurred. In England there is to-day no such context, but merely the spiritual capital of the ages of faith slowly being exhausted. Jove, Mithra, and the idols of the market, are no longer rivals of the Christian God. And we shall do ourselves and our cause a great disservice if we fail to appreciate the fact that there is a great deal of undifferentiated Christianity in the secularism around us. The problems of a Church in a post-Christian era will not be solved by quenching the smoking flax with the cold water of rigorism.

It is unfortunate that Mr Pawley should have quoted the Church of France, which as a direct result of Roman rigorism is suffering an anti-clerical movement that has hardly touched these shores. It is significant that in France those twin products of sub-Christian secularism, freemasonry and socialism, are both notoriously atheistic. Is it possible that our much-maligned bishops, who handed on to Mr Pawley the authority he claims, are in fact displaying some of the wisdom that our Lord noted as generally lacking in the children of light?

We hear a great deal about the superstitious motives of those outside the Church who are baptized, married, and buried by us. It is monstrous that our ministry to such folk should be described as "contemptible and blasphemous". Since when has the Catholic Church been afraid of superstition? Has she not rather in the past taken the practice that is "standing-over" (e.g. the Saturnalia) and endeavoured to fill it with her own rich meaning? If the first approach to the Sacraments is superstitious, let us try to correct it. But above all let us use what is there.

The niggling dealings of the rigorist priest with his flock, more especially with those who refuse to be dragooned into his Church, have at close quarters nothing of the grandeur and majesty which Mr Pawley ascribes to them. Let him not delude himself. The refusal (for instance) of baptism to a child earns him no respect from the man in the street. The latter considers it unchristian, and it may not be the first time that the untutored laity have pierced through the

cloud of controversy to the living evangelical truth. For the rigorist in England to-day is committing what has been the cardinal sin of an uninspired orthodoxy since the beginning of time.

Yours faithfully,
E. H. LEVINGE.

ST MICHAEL'S VICARAGE,
LONDON, S.W.11.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Pawley's January applause at the advent of determined janitors at the doors of the Church (whom their deriders are defaming as rigorists) rouses the hackles of what caution is in me to rush at him with caveats for distribution to these fresh Hopes of the Side. Precisian, Methodist and Ritualist did ill as well as much good, and a good deal of ill could easily be done by the new race of enthusiasts that is among us. They are not all of a feather, so all my caveats are not for all of them; and such as they are, these caveats, they have come to hand in the refining of the janitory urges of one who has himself been somewhat stiff on occasion at baptisms, marriages, funerals, and civic celebrations. Attitude and behaviour at such times are indeed important for present and future evangelization. The spirit that is in one is made manifest. They afford contacts by no manner of means to be despised, which is not to say that in them one is face to face with the folk whose hour is come, time up, to become conscious and conscientious Christians and churchfolk. With this Mr Pawley, I take it, would agree, and so too, I hope, with the following caveats, when they will prove to be more in the nature of postscripts than blow-ups of what he has written.

Ps. 147. 17. "He casteth forth his ice like morsels: who is able to abide his frost? 18. He sendeth out his word, and melteth them: he bloweth with his wind and the waters flow." To-day's jealous janitors are candidates for agencies in the Divine Action metaphorically adumbrated in the former of these verses. Highly desirable is it that they line up even more readily for part in the persistent preaching of peace and grace, forgiveness and atonement. This needs heavily stressing. Mr Pawley may be taking it as basic, but it cannot be too explicitly stated. A tighter discipline in the congregation must be responsive to the invasive redemptive love of man's maker; only so can the frost that precedes the thaw of conversion emanate from priest and people, united in vigorous conviction of God's will for all. Those who say No must say great and big Yesses, or there will be sundering of what God doth join. There can hardly be godly exclusion and saying of Not Yet to some, unless there is an effective heralding in the ears of those in the district with ears to hear of "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters", and a building up around this of something definite from which to be excluded.

Mr Pawley's rigorists seem all to be clergymen, and clergymen acting individually in their parishes, without corporate or synodical control and approval. They are passing beyond desire and discussion

to new practice such as England has really never known. Has there ever been a time when the majority of baptisms, etc., have taken place against a distinctive and vitally Christian background? The techniques of the mission field, e.g. in the latter half of the first century, are not necessarily those for a disrupted partially-christianized society. To these two considerations in face of this advance to present action let another two be added: the coinherence of these presbyteral forwards both in their congregations and in the rest of the clerisy. Team-work may be tiresome, yet the twin brother of effective tactics. For a lone priest to deal rigorously with the unchurched unless backed by a comprehending co-operative congregation will mean much muddle and misunderstanding. He must not be a parish autocrat if he can avoid it: nor must he be isolated from his fellows in the clerus if it be avoidable. It is worth a day's delay in the sally-forth to secure good measures of such double indwelling, not to streak ahead and get lost in a bog like a small dog wildly delighted to be out walking on a winter's day.

Our primary concern is not to establish a clean contrast and division between Church and world. As the Bishop of Sheffield has said, the analogy that should guide us is that of light penetrating darkness by imperceptible degrees, rather than that of box or camp with its sharp delineation between inside and outside and consequent customs and passport regulations formidable in their relentlessness (see *Christendom*, December 1946, p. 242). Our primary concern is so to become and be the Church uplifted in the Christ that a varied penumbra is being drawn towards us to share in what is so mercifully bestowed upon us, judgment and resurrection. Is it not God who grants us this penumbra, this breeding ground? Frank Weston declared it to be the Rock of Matt. 16. 18, this incipient faith, upon which the Church in the providence of God is stabilized in human society, the Church that wondrous mystery which as a tree absorbs its foundations into itself. See his book *The Fullness of Christ* (p. 119). A decaying faith is not an incipient faith, yet an inadequate faith can be wrongly diagnosed. It is truer to say the Pharisees excommunicated the Christ than he them, that Judas forsook his master than was by that master excluded. Conflict there will be. It matters much over what it arises. Let us all beware lest our zeal scorches the earth where the vine of the Lord is planted and yet growing. It isn't so fruitless and hopeless that the day for digging and dunging is over. Whatever may be true of great towns, much rattling of the janitors' keys is not a high priority in the country towns and the countryside of a county like Lincoln. The difference in the matter between different strata of society in England must neither be ridden over roughshod nor be allowed to stall all action.

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT P. SYMONDS.

THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
LINCOLN.

[We have received several other letters on this subject which we are sorry we cannot publish. Mr Pawley will have an opportunity of replying next month.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ORIGINALITY OF ST MATTHEW. A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis. By B. C. Butler. Cambridge University Press. 18s.

The sceptical non-Roman, reading on the dustcover of this book that in it the Abbot of Downside proposes to question the validity of the "Two-Document" hypothesis, may recall the finding of the Biblical Commission in 1912 (Denzinger (1937) 2165) and suppose that he may safely leave it unread as party propaganda. If he does so suppose, he will make a mistake. Abbot Butler's book is a serious contribution of considerable importance to synoptic criticism. It must be judged on its merits, and its merits are great. Its conclusions are two: "Q is an unnecessary and vicious hypothesis", and "Matthew is a source of Mark" (p. 170).

The "Q material" is first examined, and two main points emerge. One is the evident originality of Matthew; the other the fact that the Lucan revision of Q material can usually be explained as due to editorial modification of Matthew, without recourse to a merely hypothetical document. The Matthaean editing, however, which the Q hypothesis presupposes is frankly incredible; books, at least such books as Matthew, are not produced by such scissors-and-paste methods. We are compelled by the hypothesis to attribute to Matthew "a virtuosity as superhuman as it would be futile" (p. 11).

The discussion of the interdependence of Mark and Matthew begins with an exposure of what Abbot Butler calls the "Lachmann fallacy" (though he is careful to ascribe it to Lachmann's followers rather than to Lachmann himself). The only conclusion that may logically be drawn from the data of the "triple tradition" is that "Mark is necessarily the connecting-link between Matthew and Luke in these passages, but not necessarily the source of more than one of them" (p. 65). If we are to maintain that Mark was a source of Matthew other arguments must be found. The author examines those that have been used and shows, I think convincingly, that they are much less weighty than is often thought, and points to features in Matthew (such as Aramaisms not derived from Mark) which suggest that Matthew was the earliest gospel and a source of Mark. He thinks (though he insists that he is here venturing on hypothesis) that Peter in his preaching used his fellow-Apostle's gospel, and that Mark, in writing down what he remembered of Peter's discourses, also used Matthew to check his notes.

From this book, thus most inadequately summarized, at least two lessons of first-rate importance should be learnt. First, the synoptic problem has not yet been finally solved. As one who has already written against the current form of the Q hypothesis, I welcome this new attack, which is directed from a different angle. As one who has hitherto assumed, perhaps with too little investigation, the priority of Mark, I admit that I can no longer regard the position with complacency. It is perhaps time that English scholars mislaid for a

while their copies of Streeter; and if some of them could find time to read Bussmann's three volumes of *Synoptische Studien* (to which unfortunately Abbot Butler does not refer) that would be better still.

Secondly, we have not yet found the right method of dealing with the synoptic problem. Abbot Butler, who so often disagrees with the older critics, claims that his results flow from "a faithful application of their methods" (p. v). Like them, he believes that, other things being equal, of two solutions of a literary problem the simpler is the more likely to be correct (p. 1 *et passim*). But why should this be so? And if the faithful application of the same methods leads two honest and skilful exponents to opposite results, is there not something wrong with the methods? I believe there is, and that the time is now ripe for a new attack upon the literary problems of the gospels in which form criticism and source criticism shall be used side by side in a combined operation. I may further be allowed here to draw attention to a remark made by Professor Jeremias in his review of the third of Bussmann's volumes (*Theologisches Literaturblatt,* July 1932). Literary criticism of the synoptic gospels, he holds, dispenses with its foundation if it neglects contemporary literary history, especially the synoptic problem of Mishna, Tosephta, and Baraitot. A hard saying, but, I think, a true one; and it is the more to be hoped that Abbot Butler's stimulating book will encourage further study of what is by no means a dead subject.

Durham University. C. K. Barrett.

Holy Communion and Holy Spirit. A study in Doctrinal Relationship. By J. E. L. Oulton. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The heart of this book is in its fourth chapter, which points out the striking correspondence between St Paul's language about two things, communion in the Holy Ghost and communion in the body and blood of Christ. St Paul is both the first witness to the holy sacrament and the chief theologian of the New Testament, and his teaching by itself would give Dr Oulton a sufficient foundation. He gains, in fact, little positive support from his examinations of the synoptic narratives, of Acts, John, and Hebrews. They involve him in much disputable exegesis. But after we have made a heavy discount for it—have, for example, allowed for Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's understanding St John better than Dr Oulton does—we may still grant him to have shown that the rest of the New Testament is reconcilable with St Paul's clear teaching.

Dr Oulton's main observation is this: that the sacrament of the supper is not said to effect anything which the Holy Ghost is not also said to effect. So what? So the action of the supper is the condition of the Spirit's operations? Such a conclusion would not only reverse the balance of New Testament teaching, it would also leave the other gospel sacrament with nothing to do. Rather we must say that there is a life-in-the-Spirit to which Baptism is the gate, and which focuses itself in Eucharist. Those who come to the Holy Communion are already in the Holy Ghost, and would not otherwise be qualified

to partake. Such, as Dr Oulton justly claims, is the teaching of the first four centuries.

So far so good. But Dr Oulton seems to fail at the next fence. There is a life in grace, a life in the Holy Ghost, a life fed from many sources, sacramental and non-sacramental. It is the heritage of all Christians, and Baptism is (anyhow normally) the gate into it. If so, Baptism obtains an absolute position: it is *the* gate. But in trying to find a correspondingly absolute position for Eucharist, Dr Oulton falls into the same difficulties as the Reformation theologians he cites. Eucharist is *a very powerful* assurance, *a very effective* augmentation of grace. But surely a sound doctrine of the Eucharist must rule out qualitative comparisons between sacramental and non-sacramental grace entirely. The whole life-in-grace is sacramentally enacted, uniquely drawn together, and objectively consecrated in the Holy Sacrifice, and it belongs to the existence of the Church on earth that this should happen. It cannot be compared with anything else; how much it edifies us is practically important, but not theologically fundamental. Since what communion in the sacrament is after its manner is what life in the Spirit is after its manner, it is not surprising that St Paul should use the same language of both.

Who are Dr Oulton's bad men? I suppose they are medievalists teaching that salvation comes by a unique infusion of grace sacramentally effected. He must be comforted to observe how much contemporary Catholic theology is returning to the patristic position. True enough, the great Church, like Sergius in Shaw's play, never apologizes, but it is wonderful what she can do in the way of quietly shifting her ground.

Trinity College,
Oxford.

Austin Farrer.

The Church of South India. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

A History of the Syrian Church in India. By F. E. Keay. S.P.C.K. in India. Rs 1/8.

Interest in South India continues, but it is often easy to regard South India as a symbol of controversy rather than a fascinating and living geographical area where millions of men and women live to whom the Gospel has been and is being preached, with their own problems and possibly very different solutions to those problems from those which we should find. What is not always realized is the great age of Christianity in this part of the world. Mr. Keay's small book will help us to realize this. He gives a succinct account of the history of the Syrian Church from its supposed origin unto this day. Carefully and with good scholarship he examines the tradition of the apostolate of St Thomas and the subsequent history. What strikes the reader is the tragic effect on this ancient church first of isolation from the rest of Christendom and then the equally tragic results of interference with it by other parts of Christendom. The behaviour to the Syrians by the Roman Church in the Portuguese Period must surely be one of the blackest chapters in the history of that Church, nor

can the record of our own missionaries in the nineteenth century be without criticism, and whenever the Patriarch of Antioch intervenes there is more trouble. The result has been schism and schism again. There are the Romo-Syrians and the Patriarch's Party and that of the Catholicos as well as the Mar Thoma Reformed Church and Syrians who became Anglicans. And yet it must be said that this ancient church has displayed remarkable vitality and is providing teachers and leaders for the whole of India. We need to pray for their unity because their part in the development of the Church in India is considerable. Mr Keay's competent account of what are often tortuous and confusing controversies is made even more obscure by the unfortunate mistakes in binding and pagination. It is a pity that such a useful book should be marred in this way.

But the Syrians, with the exception of those who came into the Anglican fold, are not within the experiment which is going on in South India and which is the subject of the Bishop of Derby's Lichfield Cathedral Lectures for 1950. Dr Rawlinson gives a very useful summary of the events that led up to the inauguration of the Church of South India in September 1947 in which a million people are united. It should be remembered that the various sections of the Syrians constitute an even larger number and there are very large Roman Catholic missions throughout the area. But this Union is of great import for the whole Church and of course of particular concern to the Anglican Communion. The first two lectures of Dr Rawlinson's book take us from the beginning of the conversations on Union at Tranquebar to the consummation at Madras; the third lecture deals with the problem of the relationship of Anglicans no longer to an idea of union but to a united church. This chapter is entitled "Lambeth 1948 and after". The book is soberly written and carefully documented; it includes as an appendix the new liturgy of the Church of South India which deserves the most careful attention. The Bishop of Derby expresses the hope that the full riches of the Catholic inheritance of the Anglican Church should be poured into the Church of South India. There are still representatives of this tradition who have not felt it impossible to continue to work in South India, and this witness needs reinforcing so that the degree of catholicity which has already been attained may be forwarded. Earlier in the book the Bishop refers to the employment by the S.P.G. of Lutheran missionaries prior to 1828 and the many irregularities which resulted from the fact that episcopal ordination could not be received in India until the appointment of a bishop for India in 1814. The Bishop hopes that the Church of England will continue to help the Church of South India and that the way might open for the S.P.G. to establish a Special Fund for the support of the Church of South India without any legal difficulty. It will be tragic if, when the clouds of polemic are dispersed, it is realized too late that something of vital need for the growing life of the Church had been lost or submerged through the short-sightedness and lack of faith of churchmen in England.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By R. M. Benson. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

The Society of St John the Evangelist has always been reticent about its life, and in this it has simply been following the teaching of its founder, Father Benson. In 1927 and again in 1935 two series of instructions were published (since out of print); now we have a third series that has just been published. In a brief introduction, the present Superior, Fr Dalby, says how much the previous series were valued, among others by members of our Anglican religious communities. This, presumably, is the reason for this further publication. Indeed, the influence and repute of Cowley on the other Anglican communities is guarantee enough that the book will have a sure, if somewhat circumscribed, appeal. Whether it will appeal to the ordinary Christian, as Fr Dalby hopes, is more doubtful, though there are certainly passages that can be read with profit by all.

Quite apart from its devotional appeal, the book is intensely revealing. Here we have the material for a study of the Father Founder's spirituality and of the Society which he created. Visitors to Cowley are often puzzled by the ethos, which can be distinctly felt but is difficult to analyse. It has been said that the Society is akin to the Society of Jesus and again that it is somewhat Carthusian. The truth is that Fr Benson was a great man, a real contemplative (we should hesitate to call him a saint), and a religious genius. He created the Society of St John the Evangelist and it bears the mark of his personality. It is *sui generis*.

As we should expect from the date of their delivery (1874), there is no consciousness of the Church as the mystical body of Christ. The only reference to the body of Christ concerns the individual religious. In the address on Chastity it is said that when a child is brought to be baptized "the body of that child becomes the body of Christ". Referring to the last judgment, he says that for the wicked there will be "a separation of the body of Christ from the body it has assumed". In Holy Communion our bodies are cleansed from evil tendencies "by the holy energies which are within the body of Christ on which we feed". And "our impure blood is cleansed by the communication of the chaste blood of Christ". It is noteworthy that there is little (and that incidental) reference to the Sacraments throughout. Though absolute obedience to the Society and obedience to the Church are taught, it is fair to say that these addresses are concerned supremely with the individual and his relationship with Jesus for the glory of God.

Certain characteristics of the Father Founder's spiritual teaching that have found a place in the rule of the Society can be seen here—characteristics which may easily repel the ordinary Christian without a religious vocation. Indeed, even for the religious it is intended to have this effect to some extent. "We must understand that our rule is intended to be an inconvenience. It is intended to hinder us. We cannot really feel the rule in its power to help forward, but in its power to hold back" (p. 49). This negative approach is in sharp contrast to the rule of St Benedict, who speaks in his Prologue of "a

school of the Lord's service". Another characteristic is "deadness". "We are pledged to meet all the circumstances of daily life with a special deadness." Though this is because "we avow also a very special union with God", it gives the impression of a lack of the warm humanity that we associate with some of the great servants of God. The Father Founder with his intense devotion to the Holy Name reminds us of St Bernard; but it is a St Bernard without that tender human love which could compose the prayer *Memorare* to our Lady. Nor can we imagine him preaching a lament on the death of his brother after the flesh as did St Bernard on his brother Gerard. Yet both were dead to the world.

Death and the tomb in which we are buried are frequent themes—some would say too frequent. It is true that he echoes the teaching of St Paul; but one cannot forget that an over-emphasis or wrong emphasis on one part or another of the Apostle's teaching has been responsible for much division in the Church. In any case, even a description of the joys of heaven has a sepulchral ring when placed in such a setting.

Perhaps it is being over-precise to take exception to the words on the Holy Ghost on p. 90: "The powers of the Holy Ghost are ready to co-operate with him . . . the Holy Ghost waits and is kept waiting by our unreadiness . . . if we are just doing the thing at the proper time we find him there ready to meet us and to work with us." It is not meant to be exact theological language, but one would feel happier if the fact that God the Holy Ghost "prevents" us had been mentioned. There is an impression given that the religious and God are equal partners; and a mild form of Pelagianism has ever been a popular heresy among Englishmen.

Again, there may be danger in this teaching about "deadness" and detachment from the world. The religious must have gentleness, says the Father Founder, but he takes for his simile the experienced surgeon handling a tender part of the body delicately but firmly. This is no more gentleness in the Christian and moral sense than the professional sympathy of an undertaker to the chief mourner at a funeral can be called Christian love. The fact is that the complex of body, soul and mind which go to make up the human personality is too holy a mystery to be treated as a "case" in the impersonal manner of a skilful surgeon. The Father Founder himself saw that detachment from and indifference to the things of this world might cause a lack of charity, and says that the religious must humble himself to receive little kindnesses at other people's hands. The Christian in the world is only too glad to receive such kindnesses, but the religious striving for detachment might be tempted to brush them aside as a hindrance to his aim.

There is room for a new and critical study of the teaching of Fr Benson. Hitherto all has been praise, where what is needed is appraisal. The Society which he created had (and still has) an immense influence on the Anglican Church. This is eminently true in its work of guiding the religious communities of women in our communion. In one notice of this book we are told: "The fact is

Fr Benson was a saint, and what a saint has to say is always worth reading" (Mowbrays' Occasional Paper).

This is just not good enough, except as a publishers' blurb. That he was a contemplative one cannot doubt. The chapter on purity of affection recalls St John of the Cross (without the poetry). A great religious genius and an ascetic, who has stamped with his personality the order which he created, deserves a careful study. The Victorian era in which he lived has had many appraisals by historians and theologians. It is to be hoped, then, that someone will make a more detailed study of the spirituality which he created, since it still has a marked influence on many religious communities in the Church of England.

B. M. Oman.

Tunbridge Wells.

A Communion Book. By Frank Bennett and Gwyn Rogers. S.P.C.K. 3s. With Collects, Epistles and Gospels, 5s. 6d.

There are so many manuals for the use of communicants that any addition to the number has to be of a very high standard to justify its publication. Nevertheless, as any parish priest knows only too well, very few of these manuals are quite what he wants when the time comes for advising the newly confirmed boy or girl. *A Communion Book* very nearly answers a long-felt want, and it seems a pity that, where the substance is so excellent, the format is so disappointing. There is no doubt that the newly confirmed (and others too perhaps) are helped by a manual which not only gives them the Prayer Book service but, in addition, instruction on the meaning of things said and done, and prayers for use during the periods of silence before, during, and after the service. But when the Prayer Book service is lumped together with the instruction and the prayers so as to form a continuous narration, it becomes unwieldy as a devotional aid to worship. There is far too much material here and the ordinary communicant is going to be confused and bewildered, unable to find his way around whilst the priest is saying the words at the altar.

Such criticism is not intended to be destructive. I believe that this little book could be of real use to a great many people if the format were altered, so that, on adjoining pages, the words of the liturgy could be given on one side, the instruction and the prayers on the other.

I have mentioned "the prayers". In fact, these are mostly words from the Bible, and admirably chosen they are. I am sure that Mr Bennett and Mr Rogers are right in saying, in their preface, that "the Bible is much the best place in which to find our prayers". All the same, a few of the familiar prayer-classics from our treasury would enhance the value of this book, for there are many people without the gift of imagination who find the way to God easier by way of words which express what they are too inarticulate to compose.

So many of those who set out to put on paper thoughts which will be helpful to their readers over-estimate the condition of the average

member of our congregations. A retired bishop came to speak to a congregation of some fifty men at our church some years ago. He was so simple in what he said that I feared they would be of the opinion that he was speaking down to them. Not a bit of it—they loved him and they loved what he said. And they still remember him with great pleasure. The authors of *A Communion Book* have obviously tried hard to compose a manual which will satisfy the needs of the young in mind as well as of the young in spirit. They have so nearly succeeded that it seems churlish to offer criticism. With a different format this book will help enormously those who have had a grammar-school education, and that is something we have been waiting for. Will someone else now do the same for those who have left or will leave school at the age of 15?

BRISTOL. DEREK TASKER.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL PREDICAMENT. By W. H. F. Barnes. Adam and Charles Black. 10s. 6d.

This book is an attempt to analyse and, to some extent, to solve the *impasse* which faces thinking people in philosophy to-day, particularly those who are not reconciled to the view that metaphysics is "nonsense". The reader feels at once that vital issues will be discussed; to put it in more general terms, there are those who, while holding that "science has made sufficient advance to satisfy all our material needs", say that what we most need is "a new sense of values, a new religious awakening and a new orientation towards life—in short, a new philosophy" (p. 17). When, however, such people turn to philosophy for help, they find many professional philosophers saying that it is a mistake to expect philosophy to discover ultimate ends, and that its proper field lies in analysing and clarifying language. Such is the problem with which this inquiry deals.

It begins with an exposition of some of the cardinal doctrines of the analytic and positivist schools. This is the weakest part of the book. The author discusses in detail the theories of Moore, Russell, Wittgenstein and Ayer, but on a disappointingly superficial level. In particular, his treatment of Moore is incomplete. He criticizes Moore on the ground that he attacked "philosophical doctrines as untrue, because incompatible with common-sense, and did not trouble to consider the arguments brought forward to support them" (p. 57); but he does not point out that Moore's defence of common-sense statements is only intended to be on one level of inquiry—that of clarifying what exactly we do mean by common-sense language. Moore did not mean this to be the end of the inquiry, but merely a preliminary to constructing truly philosophical statements.

The conclusion that the author comes to is that the positivists are wrong in preferring one particular way of meaning, and in rejecting statements which do not have meaning in that way. Thus "science and history suffer distortion: ethics, aesthetics and metaphysics are

rejected" (p. 166). But the author does not tell us very clearly how to solve the problem which the positivist formulations raise. In his own words, he has tried only to show "that if we commit ourselves to philosophy at all there is no valid distinction between critical and speculative philosophy, no rationally defensible halting-place short of a complete and comprehensive philosophical system" (p. 183). The author has performed a valuable task in expressing the difficulties that must have occurred to many people, but he has not carried his inquiry far enough. It would have been valuable if he could have shown us how metaphysics and ethics could be justified within their own system; perhaps by means of a "picture-language". Meanwhile, this outline of the problem is a stepping-stone to the solution which it remains for someone else to find.

Susan Curtis-Bennett.

Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Presence of the Kingdom. By Jacques Ellul. Translated by Olive Wyon. S.C.M. 9s. 6d.

According to the blurb this is a "serious attempt" of a French Christian layman, a professor of law at Bordeaux, to see the facts and problems which confront the layman in spreading the gospel. There is, however, a strong temptation to dismiss it as being a piece of modern circumlocution by a direct descendant of Giant Despair. Has the author the key of Doubting Castle? No; because he doesn't think there is even a door and that we must forge new instruments to make a breach in its walls (p. 139). In the prologue which appears at the end (and this is characteristic of the book as a whole!) we are told that this is a search for such instruments. Yet elsewhere (p. 58) the author disclaims the ability to cast any new light upon the problems for the Christian in intellectual life. Existentialism, neo-protestantism, a dislike of politics, a mistrust of ethics, all surround the author's unfortunate lack of clarity. Theology appears formidable for him and he wishes to escape it, or rather to evolve a "practical theology". This, we gather, must take full account of the incarnation, *the* event to which all must *commit* themselves, as well as eschatology, yet it will be seen as a "style of life" rather than as a dogmatic piece of theology. The author deliberately refrains from giving this "style of life" any positive content, because at the moment it would not be reality, but only an intellectual theory. This, unfortunately, is not what the world of to-day, or at any time, needs to realize the lordship of Jesus Christ.

While scope for criticisms of all sorts abounds on almost every page, the analysis of the modern confusion in the world, particularly in intellectual circles, cannot be wholly dismissed. The Church has got to find the reality of this world before it can appreciate the fulness of the gospel. There may be some in our universities who are concerned with the proclamation of the gospel, who may—one in

honesty cannot say *will*—find more in this book that is suggestive and thought-provoking than at first appears.

W. S. Boycott.

Ewen,
Cirencester.

Philippians and Colossians. With introduction and commentary. By F. C. Synge. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Ten years ago S.P.C.K. published a little commentary on Ephesians whose primary purpose was theological and exegetical and which relegated the question of authorship to an appendix. It is fitting that the same author should now add distinction to the Torch series of Bible Commentaries, which in their conception perhaps owed something to Mr Synge's pioneer work. The present commentary does excellently what it sets out to do—which is to help the general reader understand what the apostle was saying. This it does by lively sub-headings and by exposition which is sometimes (e.g. of Col. 3. 18–21) quite notable, though certain highly contentious matters (e.g. the nature of the rite of initiation or Mr Synge's attempt to preserve the Pauline authorship of Ephesians at the expense of Colossians) are made too easy even for the general reader by his serene dogmatism. Greek is not required of Mr Synge's readers; but it is a pity that there should be a misprint in each of the three Greek words which appear on p. 62.

Wilfrid Browning.

Cuddesdon College.

The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. Translation and notes by William Hugh Brownlee. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12. American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, Conn. Pp. 60. $2.00.

The Manual of Discipline, one of the manuscripts discovered in 1947 in a cave at the north-western end of the Dead Sea, is regarded by the author of this monograph as highly important for the understanding of pre-Christian Judaism and of the background and thought of the New Testament. The sectaries of this document from the second, or early first, century B.C. were, he believes, Essenes. The beliefs and practices of the Essene community which are met with in the Manual have close parallels with the accounts given by Philo and Josephus concerning non-marrying Essenes. The Manual, however, suggests that in the community depicted in it marriage did take place, as does also the "Zadokite" Damascus Document, discovered as long ago as 1896. From the fact that the latter has striking literary parallels with the Dead Sea scrolls, especially with the Manual, it is inferred that the two sets of documents belong to the same sect of marrying Essenes.

The translation of the text is arranged under five headings—the

covenant of the community, the instruction of it, its practice, discipline, and seasons. The translation of a new document of this kind, with its obscurities of thought and expression—not to mention textual corruption—is a difficult task, and the author makes no claim to have produced a definitive translation. Nor are the notes he provides, generous and detailed though they are, intended to be a complete commentary. His work is thus in the nature of an interim translation and interpretation of the text. The nine appendices, which deal with special points of textual, grammatical, lexicographical, and exegetical interest, as well as Professor Albright's contribution on the much debated question of the chronology of the scrolls, add much to the value of the monograph, which is an important addition to the rapidly mounting literature on these new documents from the Dead Sea.

CAMBRIDGE. D. WINTON THOMAS.

THE ONE CHURCH. By Clarence Tucker Craig. Abingdon Cokesbury Press. $2.00.

CHURCH AND MINISTRY. By G. D. Henderson. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

IF ANY MAN MINISTER. By E. D. Jarvis. Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

THE PURPOSE OF JESUS. By E. L. Allen. The Fellowship of Reconciliation. 5s.

In restrospect, the significance of such books as these may well be seen to have been their consistent charity. When unbelief is busy stirring up envy, hatred, and malice, Christian theologians are discussing the beliefs that divide them without a trace of *odium theologicum*.

Dr Craig has played an important part in the Ecumenical Movement in America and at the Amsterdam Conference. His lectures are concerned with the radical independents who reject the movement, as well as facing frankly the issues that divide those who support it. In a book of 150 pages dealing with questions of organization, communion, baptism, and doctrine, the scholarship is bound to appear slight. For example, his discussion on page 105 of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as re-presentation does not attempt to meet the thesis of Bishop Hicks in *The Fulness of Sacrifice*. Perhaps the subtitle of Dr Craig's book suggests the reason for this omission, i.e. "in the light of the New Testament".

In spite of his obvious eagerness to understand the point of view of others, the phrases "no compromise" and "insuperable barrier" (pages 32, 64, and 77) occur when the distinctive Catholic doctrine of Apostolic Succession is discussed. The same impatience is to be seen in Dr Henderson's learned and lucid exposition of the doctrine of the Scottish Presbyterian Church on these same themes. He says that modern Scotland feels more confident and secure without it. "When we pronounce these words 'without it' we do so in the full conscious-

ness that we include the whole sacramental system from which it ultimately derives and for which it is indispensable." It is what he describes as the *superstitious* interpretation of this doctrine that he rejects, and it is notable how frequently this word *superstition* recurs in the book. Is this rejection itself an "irrational dread", which is the dictionary's definition of this word?

Perhaps the key to the answer is to be found in the slighter but no less charming series of addresses to students of the Scottish Presbyterian Church by Dr Jarvis. He says all that should be said on preaching and the preacher. It is full of practical wisdom. It is only when he comes to discuss the inner devotional life of the minister that the contrast is seen between this and that which is regarded as necessary for the life of a Catholic priest.

Dr Allen's short lectures may hint to us the way out of our apparent *impasse*. Though primarily a pacifist's exposition of his creed to his fellow pacifists, he avoids the well-worn ground of this debate. In discussing the Church and its relation to society and the world, he rightly stresses the figure of the Suffering Servant as the clue to the secret of God's way of redemption. It is only when the priestly life with its succession and commission is seen as a vocation and provision for the Church in terms of this figure that its true nature can be known. The priest has his evidence for his faith in his interior life. Such knowledge is exchanged more surely in the silent contemplation of the mysteries of God than in conference or even in book. Is it to this common prayer that God is leading the Ecumenical Movement, in order that the unity, when it comes, may be known and recognized as wholly his gift and not of man's contriving? Let Dr Allen have the last word. "I have long felt that we are approaching the question of reunion all the while from the wrong angle. We seem to have in mind that a new and greater Church can be made if each of us brings into it his own distinctive contribution. Each of us has something of the truth of God that has been entrusted to him, in doctrine, in forms of worship, or in Church government. This is something precious to be carried over into the Church of the future, and the Church of the future is a glorious synthesis in which there will be room for us all and what we value most. I do not think reunion will ever come that way. It smacks too much of pride and self-righteousness. We must prepare to enter the great Church of the future in deep contrition of spirit, each of us penitent for his own distinctive betrayal of the Lord—or we will never enter it at all. We shall come into that Church not as those who prolong into it what they now have and are, but as those who have gone through the painful experience of dying to live—or we shall never come to it at all." Dr Craig and Dr Henderson would agree with these words, and so would those to whom the distinctive Catholic doctrine of the priesthood and its succession was once a superstition and an insuperable barrier, but is now seen as an integral part of the saving act of God.

E. P. Field.

Lyng Rectory,
Norwich.

WAYS OF WORSHIP. Edited by P. Edwall, E. Hayman, and W. D. Maxwell. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

PRAYERS AND SERVICES FOR CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS. By James M. Todd. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

THE PRAYER MANUAL. By F. B. Macnutt. Mowbrays. 8s. 6d.

The first volume is the product of a commission set up in 1939, as a result of the Edinburgh Conference, which began meeting in 1947, and has produced this volume as material for discussion at Lund. After a striking tribute to the chairman, Dr Gerardus van der Leeuw, who died before the volume was completed, there follows a 25-page report (obtainable separately): this distinguishes five types of worship, and singles out six crucial questions.

The rest of the volume is cast in the symposium-form which is now becoming standardized for publications of this kind. Part I deals with the elements of worship, and consists of careful answers by members of various churches (including the Roman) to a list of questions. In the course of discussing these answers the Commission found that further light needed to be thrown upon the relation between Word and Sacrament, and Part II is devoted to eleven papers on the "inner meanings" of these terms. Here the limited field produces a more intensive approach to the subject. Three Anglican contributions are included, one Anglo-Catholic, one Evangelical, and a reprint of an excellent memorandum by the late Bishop of Lincoln. The absence of a Roman contribution is matter for regret.

The third part, Liturgy and Devotion, begins with four essays on Mariology, an issue which "poses the most agonizing problem for ecumenical thought". A final essay appeals for study of different traditions of personal devotional life; steps have already been taken to answer this appeal.

There is evidently a very lively interest in liturgy among the Protestant Churches of Europe, a widespread return to the Chirstian year, and a higher estimation of the Holy Communion. If this can be disseminated throughout the local churches, it will remove a stumbling-block far more offensive to the laity than doctrinal differences. These papers already display a remarkable degree of common ground. We find the Principal of St Stephen's House writing "Christ, embodied in people, deacon, and bishop alike, performs the various actions of the eucharistic rite" (p. 194), while Dr Julius Schweizer (Swiss Reformed) says "the Lord himself holds the service" (p. 125). At this level we are agreed. Another notable feature is a humble self-criticism not always prevalent in ecumenical discussion. One or two allusions provoke a desire for fuller information: for instance, the brief mention of the French Reformed community of Taizé-lès-Cluny.

The second book exemplifies the return to the Christian year mentioned above, being a Congregational *Temporale*. First come Sentences and Prayers arranged according to season and on a basis of invocation, adoration, confession, supplication, thanksgiving, intercession. Then three Orders for the Holy Communion for Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday: strictly speaking, this is one order printed

three times with variable portions. Finally, services for other occasions, such as Nine Lessons and Watch Night; and a particularly good series for Holy Week, based on the Marcan narrative. This would be admirable for use where the full Anglican scheme is impracticable.

Canon Macnutt's collection of 830 prayers is subtitled "for private devotions or for public use", and the choice is well suited to both purposes. It includes a larger number of recent prayers than Milner-White and Briggs' *Daily Prayer,* and of ancient prayers than *New Every Morning*; it is well indexed, and very well documented. The numbering of the prayers is a convenience for public use. It will make an excellent supplement to the Daily Offices, and be widely used in parish churches. The choice of prayers from special forms of service is particularly skilful.

St John's College, Durham. Geoffrey Cuming.

The Conflict of the Kingdoms. By C. T. Chapman. Hutchinson. 7s. 6d.

This contribution to the religious section of Hutchinson's University Library deals with the Christian message of salvation. In some hundred and thirty pages Dr Chapman traverses a very wide field. He begins with excursions into the comparative study of religion, more particularly into the ancient cults of the Middle East, and finds there what he calls "the non-rational basic elements"—redemption from the devil and reconciliation with God—which appear in a new form in Christianity. To express the common pattern he adopts two phrases of Jane Harrison's, the expulsive element and the impulsive element in primitive religion. He finds that "the picture of the life and teaching of Jesus, as given in the New Testament, conforms to the primitive pattern of salvation", since the Lord's life is seen in the setting of a cosmic conflict between the kingdom of God and the hosts of evil. The New Testament record and the experience of salvation in the early Church are examined from this angle. Two final chapters deal with theories of the Atonement and with the "symbolism" of the message of salvation. This symbolism is handled with the help of Dr C. G. Jung's theory of the collective unconscious.

No doubt there is both interest and profit in discussing the doctrine of salvation, its content and its theological history in the light of the comparative study of religion and of whatever truth there may be in the theory of the myth-making unconscious. Dr Chapman has a candid mind and considerable erudition in these various fields; and the expulsive-impulsive pattern gives unity to his book. It is, however, a risky enterprise to compress so much into so short a space. The unavoidable impression is of an over-simplified map of a vast and highly complicated terrain. Despite his workmanlike handling of his task as anthropologist, historian of doctrine and psychologist, Dr Chapman pushes his reader at too great a pace through a mass of

summary judgments which cry out for fuller documentation and analysis. With this reservation his book may be commended as a well-constructed and temperate introduction to the formidable body of material he surveys.

ELY. H. BALMFORTH.

CAMBRIDGE CHURCHMEN. AN ACCOUNT OF THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC TRADITION AT CAMBRIDGE. By John Castle. Mowbray. 1s.

This is little more than a catalogue of Cambridge men who claimed to have maintained the "Anglo-Catholic" tradition since the Reformation. Westcott and Lightfoot are included but not Maurice or Hort. It is news to us that E. C. Hoskyns wrote a book entitled *The Riddle of the Fourth Gospel* (p. 15).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Royston Pike, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Religions* (30s.); H. Guntrip, *You and Your Nerves* (8s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: E. F. Caldin, *Science and Christian Apologetics* (2s. 6d.); D. Hawkins, *The Meaning of Existentialism* (1s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. A. Passmore, *Ralph Cudworth* (15s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *Church and State* (2s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Stephen Hobhouse, *Forty Years and an Epilogue: an autobiography* (12s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER (PARIS): Roger Leys, S.J., *L'Image de Dieu chez Saint Grégoire de Nysse* (n.p.).

EVANGELISCHES VERLAGSWERK (STUTTGART): *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (DM. 18.50).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: R. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (20s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: E. Routley, *I'll praise my Maker* (15s.); *Congregational Praise* (18s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Development of English Theology in the later Nineteenth Century* (18s. 6d.).

NOVELLO: Briggs and Frere (revised by J. H. Arnold), *A Manual of Plainsong for Divine Service* (10s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. R. Driver, *The Hebrew Scrolls from the neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* (3s. 6d.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: *Freedom and Responsibility?* (2s. 6d.).

ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL: A. C. Ewing, *The Fundamental Questions of Philosophy* (18s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Florence Higham, *Lancelot Andrewes* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: W. R. Inge, *The Faith of St Paul* (2s. 6d.); H. Riley, *The Eucharistic Year* (18s. 6d.); C. J. Stranks, *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (25s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher